xxxxx,

xxxxx

London xxxxx

 16 January 2014

The Editor

Sunday Times

3 Thomas More Square,
London
E98 1RL

Dear Sir

PRESS FREEDOM

Over the past few months, there have been many Editorials and articles in the newspapers re above, both for and against. I believe in the press freedom and the plans of the press regarding the set up of an IPSO rather than the statutory Royal Charter as proposed by the 3 main parties.

I refer particularly to your two Editorials of 3 November and 22 December 2013 under the heading, ‘NOT A CHARTER FOR PRESS FREEDOM’ and ‘REASONS TO BE CHEERFUL PARTS ONE, TWO, THREE’ respectively. There was also an Editorial in the Daily Telegraph of 28 December 2013 under the heading ‘Put clear water between the press and politicians’. In the Sunday Times Editorials you have stated about your campaign for a NHS i.e. safe for patients which resulted in a policy that would make a seven-day NHS a reality, exposure of slavery in Britain, HOL expense scandal, sustainable fishing, better school meals, and the exposure of the violent criminal boss, David Hunt. I quote two of your statements in the above mentioned Sunday Times Editorials, “One role of the press is to ensure that the bad guys do not get away with it” and “We will continue to pursue journalism that makes a difference” and “It is not the job of the politicians to decide what the press can print”. Similarly in the Daily Telegraph, they have exposed the House of Commons expenses scandal. Their Editorial stated, “We just know that once the politicians have even the loosest grip on the press, the only change they will countenance in future is to tighten it” and “Or do they really want a rope around the newspaper industry’s neck that they can tug whenever they don’t like what some newspapers are up to?”

In view of your own statements as above regarding the Press Freedom and your moral decisions to campaign and expose the bad guys as well as what is in the public interest, I find it difficult to comprehend as to the reasons why you do not wish to take up my case against the House of Lords my former employer. I have suffered and **continue to suffer significant financial hardship and severe stress affecting my health**  due to the non-payment of my appropriate remuneration over many years. The non-payment was purely due to racism. There is logical evidence that the case was decided in favour of the HOL so as not to tarnish the reputation of the HOL with the stigma of racism. Furthermore, there is a trail of evidential factors that prove that Lord Irvine the then Lord Chancellor (who had a unique, controversial triple role whereby he was responsible for the appointment of
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the President and Chairmen of Tribunals and recommended the Chief Social Security & Child Support Commissioners and recommended High Court Judges to the Queen for appointment) bribed Judge Andrew Bano with promotion to the post of Social Security Commissioner and subsequently appointed as the Judge, the President of the War Pensions & Armed Forces Compensation Chamber. Over the years I have accused Lord Irvine and Judge Bano of Bribery & Corruption to the previous Lord Chief Justices but I have not been charged or even warned of libel. In December 2013, I updated my website: [www.racialabuse-houseoflords.com](http://www.racialabuse-houseoflords.com) with Appendices 1, 2 and 3, once again in no uncertain words accusing both Lord Irvine, HOL and Judge Bano. To date, I have had no warnings but they have maintained a conspicuous silence which I believe is tantamount to them agreeing with me but without knowing what to do in order to shut me up. The only thing that they must do is to pay what I am legally and morally owed.

This such payment for work carried out is enshrined in the Article 23 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. For your information it is more than a co-incidence that Judge Bano ‘retired’ suddenly. Up until my Updated Website was published in December 2013, according to the Upper Tribunal website Judge Bano was still in office, but after my updated website was published, he apparently he ‘had retired’ in 1 October 2013 when this was not the case as at that time.

This is not a case of crossing the Rubicon, but to expose the truth. You know it as well as the public that when you fight against the Establishment, the media exposure is a pre-requisite. If even Andrew Mitchell found it difficult to establish the truth, the common man or woman would have no chance, unless the press supports the person concerned if the press believe that it is the truth irrespective of any consequences may face. In Andrew Mitchell’s case, he was rather fortunate as well established colleagues of his fought for him, finally establishing the truth against the lies of the Police.

Please visit my website and publish my story in order for me to obtain my monies which are rightfully mine. I totally depend on you, otherwise I have no chance as the public is not outrage due to the non-exposure of plight and suffering which I consider is tantamount to modern day slavery at the HOL.

Thank you.

Yours faithfully,

MS PHYLLIS JAYARATNE
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